Daniel H. Deudney, *Bounding Power: Republican Security Theory from the Polis to the Global Village*, Princeton University Press 2006, ISBN 978-0-69-111901-4 Hardcover $35.00

International relations (IR) theories are like flowers in the garden, colorful, but can be classified as three main streams which indicate three main paradigms: back to the classics (the dimension of time), back to reality (the dimension of space), and back to nature (the dimension of life-force, i.e. every phenomenon of IR has its own developing law). The so-called back to the classics, primarily means back to Ancient Greek/Rome or Renaissance periods, with the classic concepts, questions and ideas, e.g. democratic peace theory is to continue the thinking of Kant's permanent peace. The so-called back to the reality means to put reality factors into the model, e.g. soft power theory tries to grasp power in the information age. Finally, the so-called back to the nature means considering the west as a local not universal concept, probing into the possibility of non-western international relations theory and its rationality, legitimacy, and matching its objectives.

According to this understanding, Daniel H. Deudney's new book *Bounding Power: Republican Security Theory from the Polis to the Global Village* (Princeton University Press, 2006) combines the first and second paradigm, i.e. back to classics (Polis) and back to reality (Global Village) in which he gives a historian's view of how future societies will handle the global reach of violence (back to the reality). Looking back at Western political thought (back to the classics), he foresees new forms of governance in the form of unions and federations that will protect liberty as they regulate destructive technologies. This can be more embodied in Deudney's security theory, called republicanism, which includes three basic ideas of realism – anarchy, society of states, and balance of power – but adds to it the dimensions of technology and violence.

The problem is, can the old bottle (republican security theory) hold new wine (non-traditional challenges)? Deudney is an excellent scholar in the west who realizes the pitfalls of IR theory. His "structural-materialist" theory of security institutions has surpassed traditional realism and liberalism. He points out correctly that IR theory adds technology and violence to the mix – proponents of the realism and liberalism theories of international relations are missing a large part of the picture. His theory indicates clearly that the traditional IR theory has been divorced from reality. However, he still fails to recognize the real reason that leads to today's dilemma. Western international relations theory considers itself as universal theory. Actually globalization brings with it diversity not universiality any more. It will be easy to predict that any theory in the name of the universal will fail again. His new forms of governance – unions, federations, communities – which he hopes can protect liberty and also monitor and regulate insidious technologies of destruction, neglecting to grasp the logic of the non-west world. So he avoids a traditional pitfall, only to find another.

Not leading to westernization or Americanization, globalization calls for a diversified world. Deudney has a keen academic insight, but he discovers more problems than answers. His idea of 'atomica: omniviolence, anarchy, and limited government' still go around in circles. Actually, harmonious relations between west and non-west, between history-oriented style of living and future-oriented life are key to solving the problems that Deudney discovers.

However, Deudney fails to escape from the western perspective, a failing he also acknowledges in the preface of his book.

Take the key word 'power' as an example. In western politics, 'power' refers the ability of one actor or organization to influence the attitude and behavior of another actor or organization.

Such a definition, strongly related to the logic of Darwin, focusing on power as the subject without power as the object. Actually, the affect of power should not only consider the ability of power subject, but also should consider the accepting extend of power object. This is the important differences between the ancient eastern tribute system and modern western international system. Traditional Chinese thinking of power is power comes from morality and morality comes from nature (back to the nature).

For example, in the eyes of Lao Tzu, it is not the problem of bounding power but bounding heart. Give up the heart to conquer the world or govern globalization which is against nature. Back to nature, i.e., according to the ways of nature or govern by doing nothing, is the key. Deudney discovers the law three thousand years later. In this regard, he is just back to the common sense.

Yiwei Wang
Center for American Studies, Fudan University